

REMARKS

By virtue of the present amendment, claims 1-8 and 10-20 remain pending in this patent application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended.

1. Applicants Summary of the Interview

On October 28, 2008, Applicant's representative conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Trieu, the Examiner in charge of the instant application. Prior to the interview, Applicant's representative submitted to the Examiner a set of proposed amendments aimed at addressing and overcoming objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action. The amendment submitted by Applicant's representative proposed to amend claim 1 so as to replace the phrase "is designed with" with the word "comprises" and thereby address the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejection set forth in the outstanding Office Action. The amendment submitted by Applicant's representative also proposed to amend claim 8 so as to recite that the nominal pressure angle is between 0° and 15° and thereby address the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection set forth in the outstanding Office Action.

The Examiner considered these proposed amendments in advance of the interview and indicated during the interview that the proposed amendments would help to overcome the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action. However, the Examiner suggested additional amendments to the claims that were deemed necessary to overcome the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action. With respect to claims 1 and 8, the Examiner noted the lack of antecedent basis for the term "nominal pressure angle" and therefore Applicant's representative agreed to further amend claims 1 and 8 to address this issue. With respect to claim 8, the Examiner also indicated that the claim would need to be amended to clarify that each of the gearwheels had the identical nominal pressure angle within the range of 0° and 15°. Accordingly, Applicant's representative agreed to further amend claim 8 in this manner.

The Examiner then indicated that amending claims 1 and 8 in this manner would likely overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 1 and the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claim 8, although further searching would need to be conducted to determine if claim 8 as amended would be allowable.

Finally, Applicant's representative requested clarification with respect to the objections to the drawings set forth in the outstanding Office Action. The Examiner indicated that the drawings would need to be amended to (1) separately show αA , αB , αC , and αD , and (2) depict nominal pressure angles with the range of 0° and 15° in Figures 4 and 5. Applicant's representative agreed to have the drawing revised in this manner to thereby overcome the objections.

At that point, the telephone interview concluded.

2. Objection to the Drawings

The drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as failing to show every limitation specified in the claims. Specifically, the Office Action urges that the drawings fail to show each of the gearwheels having the same nominal pressure angle which is smaller than 15° .

In order to overcome this objection, and in response to the clarification provided by the Examiner during the telephone interview discussed in Section 1 above, Applicants submit herewith revised Figures 2, 3, 4 and 5 which show the nominal pressure angle for each gearwheel (*i.e.*, separately depicting αA , αB , αC , and αD), that the nominal pressure angle of the first gearwheel is identical to the nominal pressure angle of the second gearwheel, and that in Figures 4 and 5, both nominal pressure angles are smaller than 15° .

In light of these amendments to the drawings, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

3. Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to due to minor informalities. Specifically, the Office Action urges that the paragraph at page 5, lines 24-28, and the paragraph at page 6, lines 21-28 are incomplete sentences and improperly refer to the claim numbers.

In response, Applicants have amended both of these paragraphs to replace the reference to the claims with the actual claim language. Applicants also respectfully submit that these amended paragraphs are complete sentences.

In light of these amendments to the drawings, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

4. Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action urges that the phrase "each of the gearwheels is designed with one" is indefinite.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to replace the phrase "is designed with one" with the word "comprising". As noted in Section 1 above, the Examiner has indicated that this amendment should overcome the indefiniteness rejection.

In light of this amendment to claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the indefiniteness rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

5. Rejection of Claims 8-10, 17 and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 8-10, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinder (U.S. Pat. No. 4,643,654) in view of Nozue (Japanese Publication Number 60-085284).

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 8 over Rinder in view of Nozue has been overcome by virtue of amending claim 8 to recite that each of the gearwheels has the identical nominal pressure angle within the range of 0° to 15°. That is to say, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Rinder nor Nozue, either standing alone or when taken in combination, disclose or suggest every feature of claim 8, including the limitation that each of the gearwheel has the identical nominal pressure angle within the range of 0° to 15°.

Applicants also note that claim 8 as amended now essentially recites the double-screw compressor recited in claim 1 that the Examiner has impliedly acknowledged is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art (*i.e.*, by virtue of not rejecting claim 1 in the outstanding Office Action as being anticipated or obvious over the prior art). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the 103(a) rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Additionally, because claims 10, 17 and 20 depend from claim 8 and therefore include all of the limitations set forth in claim 8, Applicants respectfully request that the 103(a) rejection of claims 10, 17 and 20 also be withdrawn.

6. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 1-8 and 10-20 is respectfully requested.

November 17, 2008



Scott A. Brairton (Reg. No. 55,020)
HOLLAND & HART LLP
555 17th Street, Suite 3200
Denver, Colorado 80202-3979
Telephone: (303) 295-8170
Facsimile: 303-295-8261